PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Susumu HONMA et al. Group Art Unit: 2172

Application No.: 09/836,271 Examiner: M. Hamilton

Filed: April 18, 2001 Docket No.: 109295

For: DATA INPUT FORM GENERATION SYSTEM, DATA INPUT FORM GENERATION METHOD, AND COMPUTER-READABLE RECORDING MEDIUM

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the May 21, 2003 Office Action, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 are pending.

Initially, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication by Examiner Hamilton in a telephone interview held on June 3, 2003 that the reference on page 3, paragraph No. 4, to "(col. 15-27)" should read "(col. 2, lines 15-27)". Applicants thank the Examiner for this clarification.

Applicants also acknowledge with appreciation the courtesies extended by Examiners Alam and Hamilton to Mr. Webster, Applicants' undersigned representative during the personal interview conducted on July 9, 2003.

The remarks set forth below accurately reflect Applicants' position, as stated during the interview, with respect to the outstanding Office Action.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-15 under 35 USC §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,247,018 to Rheaume in view of U.S. Patent 5,930,799 to Tamano et al. (hereinafter, "Tamano"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants do not believe that Rheaume discloses "table extraction means for extracting the table from the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means," as recited in claim 1. Nor does Rheaume appear to disclose "database defining means for defining a database based on the table extracted by the table extraction means," as recited in claim 1.

Rheaume, in col. 2, lines 13-26, discloses that "processing is performed on each HTML table identified in an HTML page so that the HTML table can be used in a database representation." Rheaume continues by indicating that if the HTML table contains certain tags, e.g., a caption tag, table header tags, <ROW SPAN> or <COL SPAN> tags, then these tags are used to generate the database table name, database table column names, and to create tables consistent with relational database tables. In col. 2, lines 35-38, Rheaume discloses that "[A]s a result of the processing of the data in the HTML table, the underlying data in the HTML table can be identified and extracted for including in a database representing the underlying data." (emphasis added)

In the first place, Rheaume does not extract a table from the data input form accepted by the data input form data acceptance means as claimed. Instead, Rheaume extracts underlying data from tables and puts that data in relational database tables. This is not what is recited in claim 1.

According to Applicants' claims, a table is input, not just data contained in a table, or data attributes of a table, and the table is extracted, not just data from the table, and a database is defined based on the extracted table. Rheaume merely extracts data from the

table and defines a database based on the extracted data contained in the table, not based on the extracted table, as recited in the claims.

Thus, Rheaume does not disclose such positively recited features of claims 1-15, which the Office Action alleges are disclosed by Rheaume.

The Office Action admits that Rheaume does not explicitly disclose "data input form generation means for generating a database-related data input form related with the database by relating the table included in the data input from accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means." To remedy this deficiency, the Office Action cites and applies Tamano. However, Tamano appears to suffer from the same deficiencies as does Rheaume. For example, in col. 3, lines 50-51, Tamano expressly states that "[A] table is defined in the database on the basis of the data attribute included in the link information." (emphasis added) Moreover, as stated in col. 3, lines 53-55 of Tamano, the display screen for input to the database is displayed "on the basis of the previously input CRF image information and the link information." (emphasis added)

Tamano goes on to state, in col. 3, lines 55-58, that "data input from the input display screen is stored into the database table defined in the above step (4)." (emphasis added) Again as noted above, step (4) defines a table in the database "on the basis of the data attribute included in the link information." (emphasis added)

Thus, Tamano suffers from the same deficiencies with respect to claims 1-15 as does Rheaume. Tamano merely extracts data from the table and defines a database based on the extracted data contained in the table, not based on the extracted table, as recited in the claims.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Tamano does not disclose "data input form generation means for generating a database-related data input form related with the database by relating the table included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means." Tamano does

not relate the <u>table</u> included in the data input form accepted by the data input form acceptance means with the database defined by the database defining means. Instead, Tamano relates <u>data</u> in the table that is input to its system with the database it defines.

Applicants respectfully submit that both references are deficient with respect to a the features recited in the claims, as set forth above. Accordingly, even if these references were properly combined, they would not achieve the claimed invention.

Furthermore, Applicants do not believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the references as asserted in the Office Action. The asserted motivation for combining these two references is to "allow a user [to] quickly input new value into the database." However, Rheaume, the primary reference, discloses a method for <u>automatically</u> processing a file. Thus, Rheaume presumably performs its method quickly. Additionally, Rheaume shows no need for any modification. Furthermore, if the added feature admittedly not in Rheaume is added to Rheaume, the execution of such an added feature would require additional time, thus teaching away from the alleged motivation, i.e., to quickly input new value into the database.

This motivation is a general statement of what appears to be an inherent quality of any computerized database system and is not the specific, detailed evidence needed to provide proper motivation to modify one reference in view of another reference. A showing of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references is an "essential evidentiary component of an obviousness holding." <u>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys. Inc.</u>, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 USPQ2d 1225, 1232(Fed. Cir. 1998). This evidence may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved. See <u>Pro-Mold & Tool Co. v. Great Lakes Plastics, Inc.</u>, 75 F.3d 1568, 1573, 37 USPQ2d 1626, 1630 (Fed. Cir. 1996). However, the suggestion more often comes from the teachings of the pertinent references. See <u>In re</u>

Rouffet, 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1459(Fed. Cir. 1998). This showing must be clear and particular, and broad conclusory statements about the teaching of multiple references, standing alone, are not "evidence." See In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994 at 1000, 50 USPQ2d 1614 at 1617.

For the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-15 are not rendered obvious by either Rheaume or Tamano, alone or in combination. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 USC §103(a) over Rheaume in view of Tamano is improper and should withdrawn.

Should the examiner believe that anything else is needed to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Robert J. Webster
Registration No. 46,472

JAO:RJW/sxb

Date: July 22, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461